

1 John V. Picone, Esq. (State Bar No. 187226)  
jpicone@hopkinscarley.com  
2 Jennifer S. Coleman, Esq. (State Bar No. 213210)  
jcoleman@hopkinscarley.com  
3 C. Gideon Korrell (State Bar No. 284890)  
gkorrell@hopkinscarley.com

4 HOPKINS & CARLEY  
5 A Law Corporation  
The Letitia Building  
6 70 South First Street  
San Jose, California 95113-2406

7 ***mailing address:***

8 P.O. Box 1469  
San Jose, CA 95109-1469  
9 Telephone: (408) 286-9800  
Facsimile: (408) 998-4790

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
ENVISTA, LLC and ENVISTA CONCEPTS, LLC

11  
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
14 OAKLAND DIVISION

15 ENVISTA, LLC, an Indiana limited liability  
company; and ENVISTA CONCEPTS, LLC,  
16 an Indiana limited liability company,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 AUDINTEL, INC., a California corporation;  
RAGHVENDRA SINHA, an individual; and  
20 DOES 1-20,

21 Defendants.

CASE NO. 4:16-cv-06765-HSG

**STIPULATION TO CONTINUE  
HEARING ON RAGHVENDRA SINHA'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT  
FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION AND/OR  
IMPROPER VENUE**

Hon. Haywood S Gilliam, Jr.  
Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler

Date: August 17, 2017  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Location: Courtroom 2

Trial Date: None

22  
23  
24 WHEREAS, on May 11, 2017, Defendant Raghvendra Sinha filed a Motion to Dismiss  
25 for lack of personal jurisdiction and/or improper venue that is currently set to be heard by this  
26 Court on August 17, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. (Dkt. No. 44);

27 WHEREAS, on May 25, 2017, Plaintiffs' Envista, LLC and Envista Concepts, LLC filed  
28 their Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 45);

1 WHEREAS, on June 1, 2017, Defendant Raghvendra Sinha filed their Reply to the  
2 Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 46); and

3 WHEREAS, the parties wish to have the hearing on the Motion to Dismiss continued to a  
4 later date, as the parties are in the process of attempting to negotiate a settlement to resolve this  
5 matter;

6 NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby stipulate, and pursuant to Local Rule 7-7(b)(1),  
7 ask the Court to order that the hearing on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss shall be continued to  
8 September 28, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

9 IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.

10  
11 Dated: August 15, 2017.

HOPKINS & CARLEY, A Law Corporation

12  
13 By: /s/ John V. Picone III

John v. Picone III

Jennifer Coleman

C. Gideon Korrell

Attorneys for Plaintiffs enVista, LLC and  
enVista Concepts, LLC

14  
15  
16  
17 Dated: August 15, 2017.

PARR BROWN GEE & LOVELESS

18  
19 By: /s/ Chad S. Perhson

Jonathan O. Hafen

Jenifer L. Tomchak

Chad S. Pehrson

20  
21 FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

C. Brandon Wisoff

Deepak Gupta

22  
23 Attorneys for Defendants Audintel, Inc. and  
24 Raghvendra Sinha

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### ATTESTATION OF E-FILED SIGNATURE

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby certify that I have obtained the concurrence in the filing of this document from all signatories for whom a signature is indicated by a “conformed” signature (/ s /) within this electronically filed document and I have on file records to support this concurrence for subsequent production to the Court if so ordered or for inspection upon request.

Dated: August 15, 2017.


By: /s/ John V. Picone III

John V. Picone III  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
ENVISTA, LLC, and  
ENVISTA CONCEPTS, LLC

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: AUGUST 15, 2017

BY:   
HON. HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE